

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants wish to express appreciation to Examiner Tsang-Foster for the courtesies extended during the interview of May 20, 2003. At the interview, applicants representative, attorney William Boshnick, discussed all rejections to the claims, as further described below.

Initially, the non-art-related rejections were discussed, namely the rejections under 35 USC §112, first and second paragraphs. Specifically, Attorney Boshnick provided a

suggested claim amendment to claim 26, which the Examiner indicated would likely overcome the rejection thereto. This suggested amendment is substantially identical to the amendment to claim 26 submitted herewith in the present response.

Attorney Boshnick also informed the Examiner that Applicants would be filing, together with the response, a certified translation of the Japanese priority document for the present application (*i.e.*, JP H11-267001), whereupon the Examiner indicated that she would withdraw the rejection of the claims under SUZUKI.

Next, with respect to the Examiner's rejection of claim 28 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, Attorney Boshnick provided a suggested claim amendment to claim 28, which the Examiner indicated would likely overcome this rejection. This suggested amendment is substantially identical to the amendment to claim 28 submitted herewith in the present response.

Next, the rejection of claims 29 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112, first paragraph were discussed. Regarding the Examiner's indication that there is no support in the specification for the limitation "plurality of bent portions bent at random angles," the Examiner indicated that she believes that, after assembly, all bent portions are *flat* (i.e., they have the same angle, namely zero), noting that the specification explains (at page 20, lines 8-10) that "the edges of the electrode plates 18, 19 together form a uniform, *flat end surface* . . ." (emphasis added), and that Figs. 15B and 15C show an intermediate assembly process. Additionally, the Examiner asserted that if the bent portions were truly bent at random angles, then the angles would range from 0°-180°, rather than at 0°-90°, as shown in Fig. 15C. Although Attorney Boshnick asserted that such was not the case, the Examiner remained unpersuaded. Nevertheless, the Examiner indicated that she appreciated the differences between the present invention and the applied references, and indicated that if claims 29 and 31 were amended to recite, e.g., that not all of the bent portions are uniform in length, such an amendment appeared to overcome the art of record, and if these claims were further amended to delete the recitation that the bent portions are bent at random angles, the Examiner indicated that these claims would appear to obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The rejection of claims 24 and 30 (and the claims dependent therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 103 were then discussed. With respect to the applied CAILLEY